

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY ROBINSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	2:25-cv-02040-TLP-tmp
v.)	
)	JURY DEMAND
RANDSTAD SUPERVISOR ALICIA)	
BROWN, 2ND SHIFT SUPERVISOR)	
LADUCHESS, ABB 2ND SHIFT SUPER.)	
SHERIKA HILL, and SEN. EMPLOYEE)	
ADVIS DANNIE PERRY,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

In his Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), Chief Magistrate Judge Tu M. Pham recommended that this Court dismiss the case without prejudice. (ECF No. 7.) For the reasons below, this Court **ADOPTS** the R&R.

BACKGROUND AND THE R&R

In January 2025, pro se Plaintiff Anthony Robinson sued Defendants Alicia Brown, Laduchess, Sherika Hill, and Dannie Perry. (ECF No. 2.) Under Administrative Order No. 2013-05, the Court referred the case to Judge Pham for management of all pretrial matters. Plaintiff’s Complaint stated that he was “petition[ing]” the Court “to proceed IFP in this matter.” (ECF No. 2-1.) But he neither applied to do so nor paid the civil filing fee. On January 23, 2025, Judge Pham then ordered Plaintiff “to either file a completed in forma pauperis application or to pay the \$405 filing fee within twenty days of the entry of this order.” (ECF No. 6 (emphasis omitted).) He explained that failing to comply with the order would result in

dismissal of his Complaint. (*Id.*) Plaintiff did not submit an IFP application or pay the filing fee, and his time to do so has passed.

As a result, on February 19, 2025, Judge Pham entered this R&R, recommending the Court dismiss the case without prejudice. (ECF No. 7.) Plaintiff did not object to the R&R. The Court now turns to the legal standard and then reviews the R&R.

LEGAL STANDARD

A magistrate judge may submit to a district court judge proposed findings of fact and recommendations for deciding pretrial matters, including the involuntary dismissal of an action. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)–(B). And “[w]ithin 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

If the parties do not object, the district court reviews the R&R for clear error. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee notes. And the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Judge Pham entered his R&R on January 7, 2025. Plaintiff did not object, and the time to do so has now passed. The Court therefore reviews the R&R for clear error.

DISPOSITION

Having reviewed the record and the R&R, the Court finds no clear error in Judge Pham’s R&R. In fact, the Court agrees with his analysis. Typically, a plaintiff seeking to proceed in forma pauperis submits the documents without prompting from the Court. But Plaintiff failed to do so here. So Judge Pham ordered Plaintiff to file an IFP application or to pay the filing fee (ECF No. 6), and he did not do so. And Plaintiff was warned that failing to comply with the

order would result in dismissal of his Complaint. (*Id.*) Finding no clear error, the Court
ADOPTS the R&R and **DISMISSES** this action without prejudice.

SO ORDERED, this 9th day of June, 2025.

s/ Thomas L. Parker
THOMAS L. PARKER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE